

United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/491,747	01/27/2000	Brad S. Konia	9403-0F255US0	9009	
30076	7590 06/29/2006		EXAM	INER	
BROWN RAYSMAN MILLSTEIN FELDER & STEINER, LLP			KARMIS, STEFANOS		
	1880 CENTURY PARK EAST 12TH FLOOR		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
LOS ANGEL	LOS ANGELES, CA 90067			3624	
			DATE MAILED: 06/29/200	6	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	09/491,747	KONIA, BRAD S.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Stefano Karmis	3624				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app	<u> </u>	orrespondence address				
Period for Reply		0.00.00.00.00.00.00.00				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1: after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period v - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from , cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 A	<u>pril 2006</u> .					
2a)⊠ This action is FINAL . 2b)☐ This	This action is FINAL . 2b) This action is non-final.					
,—	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
closed in accordance with the practice under E	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	53 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims						
4)⊠ Claim(s) 1-22,26 and 27 is/are pending in the a	application.					
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
	6) Claim(s) <u>1-22, 26 and 27</u> is/are rejected.					
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.	r election requirement					
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	r election requirement.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine	er.					
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex						
The path of declaration is objected to by the Ex	danniler. Note the attached Office	Action of form F 10-102.				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).				
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:						
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No						
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority document 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority						
application from the International Bureat		su in this National Otage				
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list	•	ed.				
Attachment(s)		(070 440)				
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D	(PTO-413) ate				
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date		Patent Application (PTO-152)				

DETAILED ACTION

1. The following communication is in response to Applicant's amendment filed 19 April 2006.

Status of Claims

2. Claims 1, 11, 26 and 27 are previously presented. Claims 2-10 and 12-22 are originally filed. Claims 23 is withdrawn. Claims 24 and 25 are cancelled. Therefore claims 1-22, 26 and 27 are currently pending.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments filed 19 April 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive as discussed below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 5. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Art Unit: 3624

6. Claims 1-3, 9, 11-13, 21, 26 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fisher et al. (hereinafter Fisher) U.S. Patent 5,835,896 in view of Brett U.S. Patent 6,907,405 in further view of Davis et al. (hereinafter Davis) U.S. Patent 6,269,361.

Claims 1-3, 9, 11-13, 21, 26 and 27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fisher et al. (hereinafter Fisher) U.S. Patent 5,835,896 in view of Brett U.S. Patent 6,907,405 in further view of Davis et al. (hereinafter Davis) U.S. Patent 6,269,361 as stated in the previous office action mailed 19 December 2005. Regarding claim 1, Applicant submits that Applicant has established his invention was dated before July 1, 1999. However, the 37 CFR § 1.131 Declaration submitted on 26 August 2005 established the invention was completed prior to December 23, 1999. There is no declaration stating that Applicant established his invention prior to July 1, 1999.

The rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) relies on the teachings of Brett, and the related applications of 08/862,547 (U.S. Patent 6,023,685) and provision application 60/018,211. In these related applications, Brett teaches automated tracking of bids during an auction in real time by updating the bid price. Applicant's argument regarding claim 1 state that the related applications for Brett do not teach an automated auction system that automatically increments a first bid to a value exceeding the second bid if the first bid does not exceed the second bid. In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re*

Merck & Co., 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). The automated auctioning teachings relied upon by the Examiner in the previous office action were taught by Fisher (column 9, lines 17-35). The Examiner did not rely on the teachings of Brett for the automated incrementing of bids and consequently the argument presented by the Applicant is not persuasive. Therefore claim 1, remains rejected and Applicant's request for allowance is respectfully declined. Claim 11 is substantially similar to claim 1 and therefore stands rejected under the same reasoning as claim 1. Dependent claims 2-10, 12-22, 26 and 27 remain rejected as stated in the previous office action, mailed 19 December 2005. Therefore claims 1-22, 26 and 27 are rejected and Applicant's request for allowance is respectfully declined.

Conclusion

7. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Stefano Karmis whose telephone number is (571) 272-6744. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F: 8-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vincent Millin can be reached on (571) 272-6747. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Respectfully Submitted

Stefano Karmis 26 June 2006

> HANI M. KAZIMI PRIMARY EXAMINER